

REMARKS

In a Final Office action dated March 3, 2003, claims 19-20 were rejected as having already been incorporated into allowed claim 15. In response, Applicant has canceled claims 19 and 20. Applicant has also added claims 22-26 to focus on the software implementation of allowed claim 15.

In the Final Office Action, claims 1, 3, 7, 8, 11, 13, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,580,177 (hereinafter "Gase"). In addition claims 1, 4-6, 7, and 11-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6, 301,012 B1 (hereinafter "White").

In rejecting Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1, the Final Office Action states that Fig 3, elements 145, 175, 180, and 185 of White show the waking of an installed server print driver and alerting the server print driver of changes in configuration data. Those elements of Figure 3 describe opening a communications port, creating a print queue and establishing shared access and querying the printer for attributable information, and updating the spooler. These elements occur only when a new printer model has been implemented in element 192. These changes do not occur merely because of modified printer parameters 190 (which was cited in the Office action as the equivalent of recognizing the changes in configuration data claimed in claim 1). In White, if only the printer parameters change, but the printer model has not changed, then elements 145, 175, 180 and 185 do not occur. Instead, the spooler is adjusted and the program terminates. Applicant's invention is not concerned with "new printer models" but addresses a problem of only changes in configuration data from an existing printer model.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 7 and 9 were also rejected on grounds that the "printer administrative programs", (actually print drivers), of Gase are the same as the "summarized printer data" of the Applicant's invention. Applicant

respectfully points out that in the last Office Action response, the updating of the client print driver was done by monitoring incoming print configuration data at the print server. Thus, the information being transferred in claim 9, "summarized printer data" are not driver programs, but configuration data which is not equivalent to an "administrative program". In the Final Office Action, it was stated that the terminology used in claim 9 may be broadly read. However Applicant believes that terminology "configuration data" even broadly read, does not include a print driver program. However, Applicant is open to changing the terminology if Examiner can suggest other terminology that would even more explicitly exclude print driver programs.

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, Applicant believes that all independent claims 1, 7, 15 and 22 and dependent claim 9 are allowable over the cited prior art references. All other claims dependent on independent claims 1, 7, 15 and 22 and thus are also believed to be allowable. Additional reasons for allowance have been provided with respect to dependent claim 9. Allowance of all pending claims at the Examiner's earliest convenience is hereby respectfully requested. In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, Applicant requests that Examiner contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Kent M. Chen
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 39,630
(310) 333-3663

FAX RECEIVED

JUN 3 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800